DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 727 PS 020 482

TITLE Coming Together: City, County and State Child Care Planning: A One Day Conference (Sacramento, California, February 19, 1992).
INSTITUTION California Child Development Programs Advisory Committee, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 12p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; Child Welfare; *City Government; Data Collection; *Day Care; Early Childhood Education; Financial Support; *Local Government; *Program Development; State Aid; *State Government
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

In February, 1992, the Child Development Programs Advisory Committee and the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) hosted a conference that explored child care planning on a city, county, and state level. Introductory activities included a synopsis of the work of the CSAC, and a talk by California first lady Gayle Wilson, who called for cooperation and coordination to address issues critical to children and families. The balance of the conference consisted of four 1-hour panel discussions, each of which was followed by a brief question-and-answer session. The first panel discussion covered the meaning and potential benefits of state and local planning for counties. The second discussion considered the availability of demographic data and methods that local communities could use to collect data. The development of a local child care plan and methods of establishing funding for such a plan were the topics of the third panel discussion. The fourth discussion examined methods of state support for local planning. The panelists, who were professionals in social services or related fields, are listed for each discussion. (BC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

State of California
CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
915 Capitol Mall, Room 250
Sacramento, California 95814

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Faith Weinstock
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED343727

PS 020182

Coming Together: City, County and State Child Care Planning
A One Day Conference

Prepared by

Child Development Programs Advisory Committee

On Wednesday, February 19, 1992 the Child Development Programs Advisory Committee (CDPAC) and the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) hosted a one day conference to explore child care planning on a city, county and state level. The conference was composed of four one-hour panel discussions, each discussion being followed by a short question and answer period. Mary Emmons, Chair of the Child Development Programs Advisory Committee, called the conference to order at 9:30 am. Ms. Emmons summarized the focus of the conference when she stated that communities are coming to understand that child care has to be planned in the same way that other community services such as, roads, schools, sanitation, etc. are planned. The Child Development Programs Advisory Committee has been given the responsibility and legislation of facilitating the development of local child care plans and will develop guidelines from input from the conference. Participants were welcomed to the conference by Supervisor Evelyn Costa, from San Joaquin County, California's First Lady, Gayle Wilson and Assemblywoman Jackie Speier.

Supervisor Costa, speaking on behalf of CSAC, gave a brief synopsis of the work done by the Association's Child Care Task Force. Formed six years ago to enhance child care resources for county employees and residents, the Task Force has used public/private partnerships to gather and publish, in the *Child Care Resources Guide*, information about child care activities in each of California's counties. The Task Force has also served as a networking tool for county child care staff, assisted in training efforts, supported AB 2141 (authored by Assemblywoman Jackie Speier) and actively encourages counties to form public/private partnerships for child care. Plans for 1992 include giving assistance to local child care planning bodies to ensure successful implementation of AB 2141. A liaison with the Department of Education has also been established which enables CSAC to assist counties in the implementation of funding from the Federal Block Grant.

Assemblywoman Jackie Speier then introduced First Lady Gayle Wilson who called for cooperation and coordination to address issues that are critical, not only to children, but to the preservation of families. She stated that California has an opportunity to craft state and local child care planning in such a way as to influence the complete development of children and called for a multi-pronged approach to address the many problems facing us. Government should be preventive, not reactive, in its approach to child and family issues. Her own focus has been in the area of early childhood health, from prenatal care through the early years. She pointed out that between birth and age six, many children fall through the cracks in areas such as child care, neglect, and medical care. Mrs. Wilson summarized how California is redressing these complex problems, such as developing the Office of Child Development and Education and passing AB 2141. She also highlighted Healthy Start, a new program which attempts to coordinate, in one place (such as schools), the services children and families need. The 1992 budget will provide funds for Check-Up, which will provide outpatient medical care for children of the working poor from birth to six years of age. Mrs. Wilson ended by reiterating the need for public/private partnerships to create a system that allows available money to follow a child, instead of plugging a child into a vertical program because that is where the money is available.

The conference then moved on to the four panel discussions. Following is a summary of each discussion.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Panel #1: What does state and local planning mean for counties? What are the potential benefits?

Moderator: Assemblywoman Jackie Speier

Panelists: Pat Gardner, Child Development Division of the California Department of Education

Kathy Malaske-Samu, Child Care Coordinator for Los Angeles County

Sue Kettman, Child Care Coordinator for Sacramento County

By way of introduction Assemblywoman Speier stated that the Department of Education became involved in the Federal Block Grant Program one year ago, forming a committee to collect data and decide how to disburse grant funds to the counties. This allowed the counties to prioritize their local planning and decide how to use the funds to develop programs for children. The Department of Education is anticipating an ongoing partnership with counties to develop programs that are beneficial to children.

Following Assemblywoman Speier's introduction, panelists shared their experiences about the benefits of the local planning. Sue Kettman stated that three benefits are immediately apparent.

1. The first is a link between government and education, two sectors which historically have had very little communication. One group has been responsible for education, while the other group has been responsible for providing services, such as safety, recreation and social services. This lack of coordination and communication has made it necessary for individuals and families to go to a variety of agencies to get their needs met.

2. The second benefit cited by Ms. Kettman is the fact that children and child care issues are now being addressed in government documents, such as county and city general plans. This is an important issue, as these legal documents guide services and approval processes, and nothing can be done on a local level if it is not written into the general plan.

3. Finally, local governments are working to make it easier to include child care in zoning and planning documents.

Kathy Malaske-Samu listed a number of implications inherent in child care planning. Child care is being recognized as an important issue. There is a growing recognition of the importance of the State's investment in its children in the form of quality early childhood programs, and the long term benefits of quality child care can be seen in lower drop-out rates and higher employment rates. The need for change is imperative for local planning and this is an opportunity for county planning to develop a vision for the future of children. Local child care planning also implies that the public has a part in the decision making process, thereby forcing public agencies to be accountable.

Both Ms. Kettman and Ms. Malaske-Samu noted the large number of non-child care people who want to get involved. They stressed that child care is a family issue. In order to find solutions, it is important to go beyond the traditional child care boundaries and include all interested individuals and groups in the process. It was also noted the planning process has forced systematic data collection and analysis to determine which services are

successful, who uses them, why they are successful, etc. The need for consensus and cooperation within the child care community, as well as between agencies and organizations was also seen as critical. Because funding is tight, decisions will be hard, further forcing accountability for the services that are offered. Shifting demographics will demand money be allocated in such a way as to allow funds to follow the child population, instead of remaining static. Child care planning cannot be done in isolation of the other needs of the children in the community. It is essential that an integrated approach be used to address all issues pertaining to children.

The panel then discussed the kinds of issues and goals that can be approached and shown as accomplishments. Although Sacramento County has not yet established long-range goals, the council has compiled a resource book and a library file system to assist others in the block grant process. They are also attempting to develop a system to streamline human services allowing a person to go to one place or agency and acquire the necessary intake forms to qualify for all forms of social services. Ms. Malaske-Samu had three very tangible products which she felt a group could produce quickly.

1. The first was to get the planning council seated.

2. The second was to begin an analysis of census data and gather information on child care services and other social services with which the child care community needs to be in touch.

3. The third was to maintain communication with agencies and continue to gather information that will be necessary later.

Assemblywoman Speier stated that in San Mateo County hearings were held with representatives from various city councils to amend ordinances that limit the establishment of family day care homes. It was also pointed out that the planning process can be used to heighten awareness of family day care, to show the community that real estate values won't drop if there is family day care in a neighborhood and to demonstrate that ultimately child care is everyone's investment.

The audience was then invited to ask questions. One of the first questions was how would the data be evaluated to determine the success of the process. Pat Gardner stated that information is being collected on how to make the system work better. This information will then be sent back to the planning councils on a county by county basis. Ms. Malaske-Samu suggested counties must be heavily involved in the evaluation. It will be necessary to look at the differences that have been made in peoples' lives, not just at the numbers of people served.

Mary Emmons asked what was intended in terms of ongoing planning and the relationship between local counties and state agencies on an ongoing basis. Assemblywoman Speier answered the intention of the legislation is to create a permanent planning process at the local level for child care and related programs. If child care is going to remain a priority on an on-going basis it will be necessary to create an agency to monitor progress. It was also pointed out the Block Grant Process is only the first step. The significant second part, which is still unfunded, is to devise county-wide comprehensive child care plans, examine the needs at all income levels and the resources. Guidelines will be developed at the state level, based on input from local and county governments.

In addressing the need for community input, an audience member asked what groups are important to bring in, what groups are dangerous to bring in, and what groups should not be allowed to participate. It was noted elders and seniors have come out against child care in some communities. They are also a strong voting block. To provide balance, it is imperative that parents vote.

Seniors must be educated and convinced to see child care as a family issue. Some fundamentalist religious groups also were seen as hostile to child care planning. It was mentioned that it is important to present child care as an issue of parental choice when addressing this group.

When asked to comment on the new registration process required by the Block Grant, Pat Gardner said licensing is more stringent. When asked how the current economic situation will affect full implementation of the Block Grant and what can be done to ensure full funding, Ms. Gardner answered that if the Department of Education lobbies in Washington to get full funding it is seen as self-serving. For this reason it is essential for parents and child care advocates to lobby for full funding. The final question asked was whether any planning money will come down to the counties. At this time there is no money in either the Block Grant or in the State budget for local planning.

Panel #2: How do local communities find and collect data? What data is already available?

Moderator: Jack Hailey, California Research Bureau

Panelists: Rory Darrah, Child Care Coordinator for Alameda County

Nancy Austin, Demographic Research Unit, Census Data, Department of Finance

Robin Wolfson, Program Evaluation and Research Division, CDE

Victor Rubin, Berkeley Planning Associates

After Mr. Hailey introduced the panelists, Nancy Austin gave a short explanation of how to interpret available census data, using an abbreviated version of the type of information one would get from the Census Bureau. Ms. Austin pointed out topics covered in the census and stated that poverty is not listed in the census summaries, because it is a derived variable on the basis of listed income. She pointed out that data is broken down into level of geography by city and county census tracts. She also made the distinction between two types of data; 100% information, which are the sets of questions which everyone gets asked, and sample information, which is information such as income, education level, and labor force status. After all information has been entered into the computer taped files, there is generally a six month wait before it is available as hard copy. Any information on the taped files can be acquired through Ms. Austin's office.

Robin Wolfson from the Program Evaluation and Research Division of the California Department of Education explained the three types of data provided through CDE. There is data collected by CDE regarding agencies and enrollment. This includes detailed information about children enrolled in child care and about the services provided, as opposed to the need for those services. There is also data collected by other agencies, such as the number of children born to mothers under a given age. Finally there is data from the census, which goes beyond the standard reports and asks for specifics. This data shows the actual need for services, as opposed to the services provided. She also noted CDE will be making two changes in the way data is collected. The first is integrating data collection into the daily management of child care programs by combining data collection, eligibility and certification forms into one form. A copy will then be sent to CDE, thus providing them with more detailed information. The other change will be to automate the eligibility process throughout the state, thus providing for a consistent eligibility and reporting process. These reports will be used to summarize information at a state and local level. This information will be returned to

the counties as feedback, showing perceived needs, data gathered, and the county's response. This will enable the county to see their relationship to the state and they will be able to determine what percentage of child care should be derived from state funds.

Next, Victor Rubin reviewed broad categories of data analysis. In opening his presentation he related how years ago there was no standardized source of data for child care, so they found ways of adapting school enrollment data for this purpose. At that time they found latch key estimates were often the most noteworthy, because it was an area which had never been examined. He noted the difference in statistics between the suburbs, where the absolute growth of the child population is significant, and cities, where there is a variable distribution of the child population because of movement of children from one area to another. According to Mr. Rubin, Zip Codes often give the best data to determine the supply and demand for child care. He explained how a group can use census information and public or private survey information to help determine estimates for areas, such as supply and demand for services or the number of families who fall between the cracks economically, not qualifying for state subsidized child care, but not able to afford private child care. He stressed how important it is for various departments to standardize and reconcile the data they collect when they are working together on a specific issue.

The last panelist to speak was Rory Darrah, Child Care Coordinator for Alameda County. In her work on the Block Grant process she learned that there is a lack of sensitivity to the need for data for child care purposes. There is no centralized place where one can go to find out what data exists. She found it necessary to go from department to department and division to division to discover what data existed, without knowing if it could even be of use. She discovered an enormous amount of data within the various county departments, such as: the Planning Department, which has all of the census information and current and projected growth; the Department of Social Services, which has AFDC data; and the Health Department, which lists births by the age of the mother. What she was unable to find was data relating how much child care costs, what the supply is and the wages and benefits for child care staff. She felt counties should be putting together the systems that are necessary to bring standardization and centralization to scattered data. As an example, she cited Alameda County's Grants Management Office which acts as a repository for grant information, proposals, etc. to facilitate better grant writing and grant awards. She closed by noting child care planning requires involvement by the public as well as by professionals and the role of the county in data dissemination should be in gathering, organizing, planning and packaging available data.

Questions from the audience included a comment from an individual who felt it is better to use census tracts rather that Zip Codes when searching for data, because Zip Codes can be changed at any time, while census tracts remain stable for ten years. In addressing this issue, the panelists pointed out it is easier to get detailed data which are not included in census tracts, because the primary users of demographic data are marketers who are interested in such information. Zip Codes also provide a larger population base, and as Mr. Rubin pointed out, in some urban areas with no growing room, the Zip Codes are very stable, not changing for many years. Audience members were also interested in the cost of securing information from the census data center. Ms. Austin stated there is no charge for data, just fees for service and computer costs, and listed the cost as averaging between $200 and $300 or less. If counties consolidate a request and submit it to Ms. Wolfson at CDE, she will then pass it on to the Demographic Research Unit free of charge.

Another audience member voiced frustration at the lack of information regarding demographics and how to use statistics. Mr. Rubin replied that in local planning departments there are staff members who use demographics for

things such as housing plans. Child care planners need to sort through and take advantage of the expertise of these county employees. When an audience member stated she had successfully obtained marketing information from private data vendors from her local library and also from the Regional Council of Governments in her area **the panelists urged caution when using privately generated data.** Ms. Austin pointed out that while such information can be cheaper and easier to acquire, one must make sure, if a private data vendor is used, their assumptions agree with what you think is occurring in your area. Ms. Darrah pointed out much of this frustration will be resolved if counties take the demographic information generated by the Block Grants and keep it current. Ms. Wolfson cautioned that without an actual survey on child care needs, the information used in child care planning is proxy data and does not specifically indicate if child care is needed. She stated one must be very careful to write down the assumptions for a set of data, so the next time data is run it will be consistent. In closing, it was mentioned that no data is being collected on non-subsidized child care since there is a wide range of such care within communities, and non-subsidized child care is not required to provide data.

Panel #3: **How to develop a local child care plan and find funding to supplement it.**

Moderator: Marge Tomczak Executive Officer of the Sacramento Children's Commission

Panelists: Colleen Kramer, Coordinator of the PG&E Work and Family Program

Bob Spidell, Editor and Publisher of Spidell's California Taxletter

Carmella Johnson, Contributions Manager for the Clorox Foundation

Angela Johnson, Child Care Coordinator for the City of Oakland

In opening her presentation, Angela Johnson noted the Federal Block Grant process has given most areas a jump on planning, because they have data and people in place to develop their plans. She emphasized that it is very important to develop an organized plan and solicit input from consumers, providers and the community in general. She then outlined the steps necessary to develop and implement a feasible child care plan.

1. Establish the need and the purpose for the plan. Once this is done, determine exactly what the plan is to do, i.e. to create new facilities, to stimulate services and funding, etc.

2. Develop a methodology to establish a lead person or agency and determine their role.

3. Determine who will be part of the planning team and establish their different functions. Determine the ways in which the public will be informed of the planning process and how the public will give input.

4. Decide on an approach to determine the availability of data in your area and the usefulness of that data to your plan.

5. Develop a timeline.

6. Convene a public hearing. Include providers, consumers, employers, funders, businesses and government. Ask those in

attendance for their input. Do not simply consign them to the role of listeners.

7. Try to gain consensus on the need and the purpose of the study.

8. Develop a working group to determine long and short term goals, desired services, funding sources, and a realistic budget. Make sure your plan does not replace, but builds on resources already available in your community.

9. Be creative in your planning.

10. Edit your plan.

11. Convene another public hearing to get input and agreement on a final draft.

12. Finalize your plan.

13. Find funders.

Carmella Johnson then presented a short summary outlining how the Clorox Foundation has worked with the City of Oakland and Alameda County over the years to address the child care issue. In 1984-85 the Clorox Foundation supported infant and toddler care by funding the Bank of America's California Child Care Initiative which provided funds for establishing family day care and training. In 1986 Clorox created its own initiative and got funds for child care in Alameda County and Oakland. In 1988 the City of Oakland established the Child Care Coordinating Council, and in 1990 a comprehensive five year child care plan was developed for Oakland by a private consulting firm. One of the priorities targeted by the plan is to develop a funding vehicle for child care in 1992-93 called the Oakland Child Care Foundation. The goal of the Foundation is to raise one-half million to one million dollars per year from individuals, corporations and businesses. By developing a public/private partnership with the City of Oakland, they hope to supplement available city and county resources to address the issue of child care. She then listed a number of corporations, such as Mervyns, AT&T, Pacific Bell, PG&E and the James Irvine Foundation, which are working to address child care issues. Ms. Johnson stated that, even prior to developing a child care plan, it is essential to include local corporations so they may be involved from the very beginning and will allocate human and financial resources to the plan. She also suggested using the local foundation center in each community to research corporations funding youth and children's issues.

Colleen Kramer, Coordinator for the PG&E Work and Family Program in San Luis Obispo County, opened her presentation by stating the issues facing rural counties are different than those facing urban counties. Rural counties do not have access to a lot of the foundation monies that are available to larger, urban counties, so they draw from the multiple resources available in the communities. In 1989 PG&E, as a local employer, became involved in child care issues by examining what could be done to coordinate local resources for child care. PG&E developed a community-wide group to coordinate and discuss the availability, affordability, and quality of child care. Included in this group were both large and small businesses, government (both as an employer and as a service provider) and all the child care professionals, both family-based and center-based. Eventually a group called Community Partners in Child Care was formed. It became the designated planning council for AB 2141. Ms. Kramer credits their success to three factors.

1. The key feature was a community-based approach, employing a public/private partnership to work with several groups, including child care professionals.

2. The group was bipartisan. Political differences were set aside so there was no political agenda interfering with planning.

3. Everyone had the same set of needs, and were very active in targeting how these needs could be addressed locally. The objectives were realistic. They broke the large picture down into its smaller components and worked towards those smaller pieces individually until they were attained.

Ms. Kramer then outlined the steps the planning council took in order to attain their goals.

1. They identified the need.

2. They developed action plans which they placed into committees. These committees educate and raise community awareness of the issue.

3. They found funders.

4. They continually evaluate as they move forward.

Acknowledging that funding can be scarce in rural counties Ms. Kramer noted her group accepts small amounts of money whenever it is available. They use their funding from PG&E, the county, city grants and R&R grants to target training for family child care staff. Although the total amount of funding provided by AB 2141 for San Luis Obispo County is relatively small, it provided the impetus for Ms. Kramer's group to write down their needs and objectives.

The final panelist, Mr. Bob Spidell, Editor and Publisher of Spidell's California Taxletter, explained the little-used Employer Child Care Tax Credit available in California. In 1988 California passed a bill providing a tax credit for private employers who provide or subsidize child care for dependents of their employees. Following a specific formula and guidelines, the credit for employers who subsidize child care expenses is 50% of the cost of subsidization, up to a maximum of $600 per subsidized dependent per year. There is also a credit available for employers who set up and run a child care facility for their employees' dependents. This credit is 30% of the start-up cost, up to $50,000 per employer per year. These credits are available to all private businesses, but not to government or non-profit agencies. Mr. Spidell stated that, in his opinion, the best way for a private employer to fund a child care program is by taking advantage of the tax codes, since both credits and deductions are available. The advantages of having employer sponsored child care range from better morale and productivity on the part of the employees, to actually making money by taking advantage of the tax credits and deductions.

The first two questions from the audience were directly related to Mr. Spidell's presentation. The first question asked why such a small number of employers take advantage of the California child care tax credits. Carmella Johnson felt it was because these credits were not publicized enough. She urged employers become educated about the credits. There was also discussion about benefit equity, with concern expressed over whether offering benefits, such as child care, to one group of employees could be construed as discriminatory by the employees who had no need of said benefits. Mr. Spidell stated that while a business cannot discriminate, they are not required to offer a benefit to someone who does not need it. Carmella Johnson said Clorox offered a compromise to those employees who did not need child care subsidies, in the form of subsidies for elder care. Ms. Kramer added at PG&E child care is considered part of an overall benefits package. When asked if he feels his child care plan has benefitted his business, Mr. Spidell answered

affirmatively. Both productivity and attendance has increased for those employees who use the plan. Mary Emmons asked the panelists if corporate sponsors are interested in matching grants from the State. Carmella Johnson stated matching funds are a great incentive for funders to stretch their dollars. She also observed many foundations fund rural areas and suggested that individuals from rural areas ask for a com-search data base listing of corporations and foundations that offer funding in different areas.

At the end of the session a representative from Cal-Trans announced Cal-Trans has created an Office of Child Care and Transportation to address issues surrounding transporting children to child care. Cal-Trans is trying to use its resources to address both child care and transportation problems by examining solutions such as transporting children from Park and Ride lots to their child care locations.

Panel #4: How will the State support local planning?

Moderator: Evelyn Costa, San Joaquin County Supervisor

Panelists: Jane Henderson, Assistant Supervisor and Director of the Interagency Children and Youth Services Division of the Department of Education

Melinda Sprague, Child Development Programs Advisory Committee

Beth Lowe, Los Angeles County Children's Services Commissioner

Ms. Costa opened the discussion by stating that county government is trying to be a partner in the issue of child care.

Ms. Lowe stated the importance of strategic planning at the state level to begin to list priorities and outline how these priorities will be pursued. Coordination of services is imperative to address the needs of the whole child. Ms. Lowe then outlined a specific list of what can be done by the State to encourage local child care planning.

1. The Department of Education's Child Development Division should channel some Block Grant money, to be matched by local governments, to support local planning efforts. Communities could then apply for planning grants on a one-time basis. The Office of Child Development and Education could act as a catalyst for these efforts.

2. Child care should be viewed as a preventive service. The Office of Child Development and Education should see that state supported pre-school be viewed as a part of the child care system.

3. The State should review the Department of Education rates to providers which were designated with state pre-school funds and the number of children to be served.

4. Grants should be provided for the publication of recommendations of local planning bodies to help identify areas of greatest need.

5. The State should act as a clearinghouse for planning information and provide technical assistance and distribution of the names of individuals to be contacted for assistance.

6. The State should play a major role in ensuring that families who are eligible for federal funds apply for and receive earned income credit.

7. Child care providers must open lines of communication with social services. As social services become more active, they must also be held more accountable.

Melinda Sprague, Chair of the Resources and Regulation Subcommittee, Child Development Programs Advisory Committee, began her discussion by addressing the problem of data collection. She felt the State should set up specific guidelines to standardize data collection, so the available data can be used to make valid comparisons. Ms. Sprague also suggested the establishment of some form of implementation assistance to help first-time grant recipients get their programs up and operating within the mandated guidelines. During the implementation phase she felt it would be necessary to return to a regional-type of meeting in which individuals could volunteer their expertise. She felt state agencies need to collaborate to eliminate roadblocks to efficiency, reducing paperwork and becoming family-focussed, so families can get the type of help that fits their needs, rather than spending an inordinate amount of time filling out forms.

Service providers also need to stand together against overwhelming problems. The State can encourage this by rewarding collaboration, perhaps through grants that encourage partnerships. She also pointed out that, although the Block Grant Funds are for services, it is possible to use carry-over money for planning. She stated counties and agencies must plan now to effectively use available carry-over funds, should they become available. Finally, the State needs to monitor the services which received funding and those which did not, and it cannot ignore local input in these matters. We all must advocate those necessary services which still need to be delivered. She closed her presentation noting though increased funding may have fostered competition for available money, it is necessary to set up a goal, keep the goal in sight and work together to achieve the goal. As she succinctly stated, "What we do with children can be wonderful, but what we do with families is what lasts."

The final panelist of the day was Jane Henderson, Assistant Superintendent and Director of the Interagency Children and Youth Services Division of the Department of Education. She started her presentation by saying the State is working to send the message that collaboration in planning is very important. The State must provide the necessary support to make local planning and collaboration successful. She then listed the three areas in which the Interagency of Children and Youth Services has responsibility.

1. The implementation of the Healthy Start Act is the first area of responsibility. Healthy Start provides $20 million in grants for school districts or county offices of education to plan and/or implement collaborative school-based support service programs for children and families. Although the funding goes to the schools, the schools are not expected to be the lead agencies or providers of all services. They are to provide access and referrals for services. The funding will be for the development of local collaborative partnerships, with the schools working in collaboration with other agencies. The initial target population is low-income students in grades K-12, but it must also help the families, as well as the students.

2. Healthy Start is the beginning of a comprehensive state-wide program being developed cooperatively by the Interagency of Children and Youth Services with the directors of each of the

departments offering services to children and families, such as Social Services, Mental Health, Health Services, as well as the Office of Child Development and Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This group is working with the Federal Government to obtain waivers from the Federal Medicaid Program so entire school districts can be designated as Medicaid eligible. This would allow a much broader array of schools to participate. They are also looking to change the system of care to a system based on per capita funding in order to provide managed care and managed services for all children in all school districts, thus focussing on prevention.

3. They are also working toward internal coordination within the Department of Education, by examining child care and development in conjunction with other programs offered in the Department of Education.

Ms. Henderson ended her presentation by summarizing a number of Senate and Assembly bills which work toward the ends she described. In addition to Healthy Start (SB 620) and AB 2141 which provides for coordination of local planning, there is SB 997 and SB 786 which provide incentives to counties and schools to develop coordinated service programs to children and families.

The majority of the questions revolved around the Healthy Start Program. When asked whether there were planning dollars for local communities for the Healthy Start plan, Ms. Henderson stated that there was both planning and operational grant money. Another question addressed whether only school districts may apply for Healthy Start. In answer, Ms. Henderson explained school districts or county offices may apply, but that certain stipulations must be met. Mary Emmons ended the discussion by asking if there is something individuals can do to encourage collaboration at the state level. Ms. Henderson answered by saying things are already happening at the state level, but it takes time, and patience is important. There is already a public/private partnership at the state level with nine private foundations. These foundations are lending support toward the development of the State Interagency plan for both Healthy Start and the federal Medicaid piece. In closing Ms. Emmons reiterated that, as the State moves toward collaborative efforts, it is critical that not only agency heads be included in the planning process, but also the vast private sector, which is especially important in the child care arena.

Assemblywoman Speier gave a short closing statement. She expressed her hope the program had been beneficial to those who participated. She also was empathetic toward the frustrations expressed over lack of funding and pointed out the way to go about it is to become established, create credibility, and eventually justify funding. Closing on an upbeat note, she urged the participants to, "think big, think bright, and we will achieve a lot for the kids in our state."